

Appl. No. 10/601,145
Amdt. April 22, 2005
Reply to Office action of February 3, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Applicant canceled claims 1, 2, 16, 18, and 20, which were rejected for being anticipated by Bivens ('799). Applicant amended claim 3 so that it is now presented in independent form. Pursuant to Examiner's comment that claim 3 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form, claim 3 is no longer anticipated by the '799 patent and should be allowed. Further, applicant amended claims 4, 8, 9, 11, and 12 to depend from allowable claim 3. Thus, claims 4, 8, 9, 11, and 12 should also be allowed. Claims 5-7, 10, and 13 remain in their original form, but should be allowed because they also depend from allowable claim 3.

Examiner indicated that claim 16 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. Instead, applicant amended claim 14 to include the limitations present in claim 16. As this amendment has the same effect as writing claim 16 into independent form, claim 14 should be allowed. Claims 15 and 17 are presented in their original form, and both depend from allowable claim 14. Therefore, claims 15 and 17 should be allowed.

Examiner stated that claim 19 would be allowed if rewritten into independent form. Accordingly, claim 19 has been written in independent form, incorporating all the limitations present in canceled claim 18. Therefore, claim 19 should be allowed.

Appl. No. 10/601,145
Amdt. April 22, 2005
Reply to Office action of February 3, 2005

In light of the foregoing, applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth A. Keeling
Registration No. 31,842

Keeling Hudson LLC
P.O. Box 70103
Houston, Texas 77270
(713) 680-1447
(713) 680-8567 Fax